Ref. - Edge — 604.
Stark 058

NEW CHRISTIAN

MAY-JUNE Edited by Kenneth Leslie

THE LIBRARY OF THE
JUN 20 1956
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
NEW YORK

Communism's Vital Challenge

By James L. Brewer

Thy Grace So Abounding

By John Tunnicliffe

God and the Russian Invasion

Editorial

The Powell Case

By Louise Harding

Vol. XII, No. 3 30 cents

COMMUNISM'S VITAL CHALLENGE

By James L. Brewer

On May 7 the Associated Press from Paris electrified the world with the news that the NATO's (North Atlantic Treaty Organization's) "Three Wise Men" had set out on their historic mission of reshaping and reinvigorating the Atlantic Alliance to combat Soviet Russia's new trade-and-aid program to win the neutral third of the world to the side of the west.

The project was historic, indeed, primarily as initiating a notable program of revision of United States foreign policy in reaction to sensational changes in Russian policy and developing domestic political dissatisfaction with what was being viewed as a faltering American policy in international relations.

British Ambassador Lloyd urged there was "no reason why we should not take the offensive in propounding our political ideas throughout the world," and proposed his pietistic concept of the "Three Wsie Men" for implementation of the project. A "manifesto," confined to political and economic fronts it was declared, was being counterpoised to "the new era of Soviet smiles and economic blandishments."

The able U.S. ambassador, Charles E. Bohlen, vouchsafed confidence in good faith of the new Russian look as being through with Stalinism, trying to make collective dictatorship work. No inner struggle for power within the ruling group was discernible, he judged, but considered the dominant political purpose of men like Khruschchev, Bulganin, Zhukov and Malenkov to make the collective system work.

THESE WORDS would seem to give credence to Khrushchev's humble assurance in London to the Free Worlders:

"You, gentlemen, do not like communism. We are aware of this, and we do not hide the fact that we do not like capitalism; but we must live in peace. Naturally, we do not demand that you love us. However, it is impossible not to recognize the fact that such a great country as the Soviet Union does exist, and that country wants peace, not war. As they say: You have to live with the neighbor that God has sent you, and not with the neighbor you would like to have."

Columnist Walter Lippman has said: "The emergence of the Soviet Union as a competitor is one of the great historic developments of our times."

Rather sensational was a report of C. L. Sulzberger of the New York Times on April 18, of profound changes in Soviet countries on his return from a study tour of Eastern Europe.

He expressed conviction of sound reason for State Department's change from a foreign policy primarily on military basis, and advised against any reliance on expectation of success of promotion by us of counter-revolution provocation.

"Whether we like it or not," Sulzberger is quoted, "revolution is a fact in East Europe, to be dealt with realistically and with diplomacy." He concluded Geneva established that war was out as political disagreement

and the ground laid for peaceful co-existence.

THE EMINENT pamphleteer, James P. Warburg, noted economist, has issued a third printing of his memorable pamphlet of 1954 entitled "Turning Point Toward Peace," calling for a positive American program. He had made his starting point the unusual, joint action of seventeen, solicitous, freshman Congressmen in open plea on the House floor for "a revitalized foreign policy which would put political, social, economic and spiritual flesh on the bare bones of our military measures against communism."

As light on foreign policy revisionism, William A. Williams of the history department of Oregon University in the May 5 Nation Magazine says the narrow and militant anti-Soviet policy actually worked to improve the popular morale and increase the power and influence of the Soviet Union throughout the world.

THE RECENT "World Awareness Conference" of scholars meeting at the University of Rochester, culminated in a profoundly moving sum-up of its survey by Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, at a large public meeting.

Stressing the importance in the world pattern of the universal man, the speaker declared that "In world crisis we may not deceive ourselves as to the world background," deeming moral leadership as the vital commodity of America in convincing the majority of the world's people that we are "ready to join the human race," in giving evidence of our respect for them as "human beings and not inferiors, biologically or politically."

"We need not lose to communism by default in the battle for the majority now looming in the world," he continued. "The United States is equipped by history to be a champion of those people. We must comprehend the significance of our own history."

THE BURDEN of the Conference related directly to the introduction of studies of the non-western civilization into under-graduate programs in colleges and universities.

Editor Cousins declared the native Asia-African Bandung Conference on colonialism the greatest event of the 20th Century.

Rochester University's President deKiewiet, who participated in the Rochester conference, made a signal contribution to its theme by an article in editor Cousins' publication in 1953, significantly entitled "Let's Globalize Our Universities," envisaging need for a general revolution in teaching so the educated American would be as familiar with Chinese, Indian, Russian civilizations as with those of Europe, to correct a dangerous illiteracy" of Americans in regard to current world problems that was leaving them with enormous "blind spots."

"Only as our education is broadened today to include in its compass a full perspective of the humanities of the other peoples," wrote Dr. deKiewiet, "can we hope to reach in the coming world satisfactory relations. We are discovering a new world under compulsion too great to exaggerate to develop an effective consciousness of it, a new world produced by faltering of the West."

"After all," said Jane Adams, the noted Chicago Hull House humaniterian, a number of years ago, "communism has provided the challenge of

the vitality and good faith of opposed systems recognized as the meaning of freedom from Milton to Mr. Justice Holmes."

THY GRACE SO ABOUNDING

The Pastoral Scene In England
By the Rev. John Tunnicliffe

Never was there a time when so little was done by so many for so much money as now. It is true that prices have outstepped customary standards, but the margin of money available for necessities and for pleasure has never been so large.

We live in a time of full employment, but if the amount of money earned for war-making is compared with the amount which can be used for peace-making the result is fantastic.

Since the war, Capitalism has been able to dig in again. We are for the most part conditioned to serve the purpose of Capitalism. All that matters in the field of publicity at all levels serves the purpose of the Capitalist status quo.

Religion in England, as represented by the Church of England, though the other Churches are in like case, is now subserving the purpose of anti-Socialism.

We forget so soon. Our rulers know this well. And if it happens that we are called again to war there will be the same old lying reasons promulgated and the same willing response on the part of the young. Just to make sure, the Government maintains conscription, but even without it the generosity of youth can be relied on to go to war because it will be disguised as love of country. And the Churches, as things are will talk big about "greater love hath no man than this" etc. etc.

Meanwhile we have to recognize that less real culture is being produced by vast expenditure on education than ever before. And in spite of the National Health Service there never was a time when so many beds in all the hospitals are occupied by mental and nervous sufferers.

The Established Church of England can be sure of big money from big business so long as its members are doped with content that things could not be better.

There is even a resurgance of religion of a sort. For man is a religious being and he can not be quite happy unless he has some sort of divine sanction for his action.

We Christian Socialists look to the folk who still frequent Churches for a forward move. Our answer will not come from there, for the Kingdom of God is something round the corner in our teaching and is not related to the here and now. So Churchgoers are likely to be offended by any reference to a world in which about half the people are in danger of starvation and of sickness.

Trade Unionism in England had, undoubtedly, a Christian religious origin. Now it has to be admitted that Trade Unionists, by and large, hope for nothing better than to become little, or big capitalists.

Where then is our hope? Where can it be?

There is big promise for sacrifice amongst the young. There are little groups who will give all for all. But we Christian teachers seem unable to put across a sufficiently risky challenge. Is the Kingdom of God worth while?

The writer of these notes is parson of a country parish of five hundred souls, mostly engaged in farming. For every pound which is given to the Church it is true to say that a hundred pounds leaves the village for gambling. I do not blame the gamblers. I love them. But their action betokens something in th enature of a verdict on things as they are.

Oh yes: there is as yet no hatred of Jesus Christ. That may come later as it has come already amongst those who profit most from Capitalist society.

BUT, and it is a big "but", what about the here and nowness of LOVE INCARNATE?

Religion is sentimentalised out of all recognition as compared with the undivided Church of the first three centuries of the Christian religion.

In England we are in danger of a renewed Erastianism. The Church of England is expected and almost ordered to become a sort of moral Post Office department of Government. And Government means Capitalist Government, whether it comes in the guise of Toryism or of Labourism which has forgotten its hard-won gains.

I can only speak for what I know of the Church of England after forty years and more of attempted and happy ministry.

I can say, however, without fear of contradiction, and not caring what happens to me, that the Holy Sacrament is very far from being what it is meant to be by divine order, namely the sharing together of the very Body of the Crucified and Risen Lord.

In a world where the material and the spiritual have suffered woeful divorce there is little room for the kind of fusion accomplished once for all by HIM WHO came and suffered our very depths in order that here and just now, and as things are, we may share HIS victory.

Our folk, all of them, are so hungry for the Bread of Life instead of stones. They, bless them, for the most part do not know this in definable terms.

What can we Christians do to-day? What can we Christian Socialists do now?

Just this: we can suffer in our respective ways for the sake of GOD'S lovely Kingdom here and now. We can go on patiently teaching that GOD'S Kingdom is upon us not far away.

AND we can insist always and everywhere that many who seem to be within the Church of GOD are without it, and that many more who seem to be without the Church are really serving the cause of GOD.

Dear GOD: forgive our unbelief. Help us to trust and to expect the utmost by THY grace so abounding.

GOD AND THE RUSSIAN INVASION

Many self-styled atheists are not so much atheists as anti-God. As you listen to them ridiculing the *theory* of God there appears often to

be an animus in their contempt which could not be evoked by a mere theory. There is a hatred which returns again and again to an object they have not been able to banish from their imaginations.

If and when they do completely banish this object, be it Jehovah, Jupiter or Allah, they may be able more easily to accept the fact that men have learned much in their various schools of the gods. Professed atheists frequently live by a very strict code, a code common to the great religions and ingrained into men by religious teachers and prophets. Moreover, in banishing these god-objects the atheist serves the God beyond object.

If God is not *a* God, then he must be God, whom to adjectivize is not possible except by the use of paradoxically non-describing or non-defining adjectives such as the Unknowable. But although he may not be known he may be met and he may be loved or hated. Not with the mind which loves not, nor hates, but by the human person, an equally unknowable entity.

In the full strength and pride of our youth, in the fullness of our human power some of us may feel that we are a *center*, a *source* of power. To a degree it is a good feeling. It is the humanist feeling. The man of the Renaissance had it. The Russians and the Chinese have it today. It is good to the degree that it realizes that all that is good in it *was given to it.* Beyond that it becomes promethean and turns in upon itself.

As surely as fish live in and by and as part of the water they swim in, so surely does man live in and by and as part of the universe. And since men are conscious intelligent beings they must take account of this situation.. If in their minds they try to cut themselves off from the universe they begin to die, for they have no other life.

There is nothing so cut and dried, so dead on his feet as a *practising* atheist, nor so alive as a *practising* theist. But, as men swing from one extreme to another, there is a lag in theory catching up to practice. Marx repudiated theism but few men have been more theistic in practice, a completely dedicated man. The mask of cynicism in his "class" ethics covered a passion for universal ethics. Historical progress was his "God"; the revolutionary Marx-instructed working class was "God's" agent; Marx himself was His prophet. No cold scientist, but God's angry man.

On the other hand, the imperialists and cartelists who practise class (upper class) ethics with complete cynicism and do everything possible to *obstruct* universal ethics are theist in theory. The "God" they claim to love, and in whose name they commit their crimes is an abstraction. They hate the real God with all their insides. They are *practical* atheists. Among these we should count many of the plenipotentiaries of the great historic churches.

During this whole revolutionary period we have believed, and have worked in the faith, that there will come about a re-integration of theory with practice, that the children or grandchildren of the early Marxists will bring their theory into consonance with the brotherhood-meaning of their practice. Furthermore we believe that in the Communist status universal education plus the drive to brotherhood will bring about a true democracy which will protect *all* minorities. This is in process now.

We must not expect it to happen today or tomorrow.

From the Tzars through Lenin and Stalin to Krushchev Russia has been ruled by one man or a small committee usually dominated by one man. The distinguished journalist, I. F. Stone, has just returned from a visit to Moscow saying: "This is not a good society and it is not led by honest men." To which we would reply that it is a society struggling to be good and led by men who try very hard to be honest. We watched Krushchev on TV at a press conference in Britain. Fearless and at ease in a largely hostile atmosphere he handled himself with a refreshing forthrightness that won his audience. With whom would we compare him for honesty? John Foster Dulles ? ?

The struggle of man today, as always, is with himself. It goes on within each and every man an dwoman, yes, even child on this planet. On the world scene the struggle is between nations and blocs of nations, the Western bloc and the Eastern bloc. And within each nation the struggle goes on in every phase of life, education, culture, business, government. It would be ridiculous to think that this struggle is over and done with in the Eastern bloc, even though the struggle for the balance of political power is over. Political power has not the last word to say in revolutionary change, especially when that power has not evolved out of a democratic chysalis. It is merely the foundation or pre-requisite for that change. The final word is spoken in the soul of man where he says yes to the change, where his mind is on fire for the change. This localizing of the battle in the individual should not be confused with the so-called cult of the individual. In fact it is the only thing that will destroy the cult of the individual. For according to that cult we fall into the temptation of saying that the battle is won in the mind of some particular hero. Yet the battle must be re-fought and re-won every day in every man, and the greatest man is he who recognizes this and never relaxes his vigilance against the foe.

We have a fatal tendency to rest on our laurels, or, which is just as bad, to rest on another's laurels, Ho Chi Minh's or Mao tse Tung's or Mattyas Rakosi's. Yet these great men are only great because they are constant and humble in their unremitting struggle with themselves and with their parties to prune and cleanse themselves and their parties of all the sins the flesh is heir to. The criticism and self-criticism to which these men subject themselves and their comrades are constant and devastating.

The thing which amazes and confounds Western pessimists is that the direction in the East after all this time remains upward. Certainly downward forces are operating in the East: pride, careerism, all the evils incident to the possession of absolute political power. And these evils will not necessarily diminish with the steady rise of economic power, although the friendly invasion of underdeveloped countries by Soviet technicians is the Christianly correct method of countertcting these evils. Such an invasion has been started, and it is in this invasion that the characteristic faults of Bolshevism will be overcome. Perhaps we should say may be overcome; but it is our faith speaking. What, faith in Bolshevism? you ask. No, faith in God, who has used Bolshevism, and, having used it,

may lay it aside. And, ironically, those party-worshippers who are stuck-with-Bolshevism and who have made their party into *a* God will be the hardest to persuade that the time has come to put the religion of Partyism away in the archives of history with other at-one-time useful religions. For they have turned a proximate into an ultimate, the mistake of idolators, the mistake which the prophets of all religions have condemned.

As soon as God becomes an object, a thing, even a personal thing, an entity among entities, describable, definable, definite, right then atheism becomes a virtue, indeed atheism becomes *true theism.* For true theism abandons all gods, plural or singular, with or without the big G, as ultimates, moves behind them and beyond them and keeps the road open for a view which is never closed, for a goal which is never reached. It is this unattainable, this unknowable, this ever-receding horizon which is the "God" of the true theist. And it is a faith, not a knowledge, so this theist is an agnostic. To *know* there is a God, to "prove the existence of God" as the radio bishop claims to be able to do, is as smug, as phillistine, as cheap, as *to know there is no God.* We are too limited, too dependent to be able to support or to contain such proofs.

The God of the true theist is as far beyond the reach of our proofs or disproofs as Keats is beyond the understanding of an unborn child. In relation to the purposes of God we are all unborn children, which may be why Jesus said we must be born again. Instead of speaking of God, for a moment let us speak of "whatever it is that leads." "Whatever it is that leads" makes our fists to hammer against the walls of our confinement, makes us struggle to gain entrance into a new world, a new era. The fists are pitiless, cruel. The old must suffer and be sacrified to bring forth the new. Yet in the economy of "whatever it is that leads" the unfolding life may be served by the sacrifice.

Marx, Lenin, Stalin were fists that, in crescendoing staccato blows, rained hard against the "containing" walls. Have we not used that very word; containment? What containing walls? To be precise and concrete, the walls of capitalist imperialism; but in addition to these all the walls of ignorance and superstition, all the fixed ideas including very frequently the fixed ideas of the Communist leaders and thinkers themselves) of men who worshipped doctrine. No fixed doctrine has yet been able to contain the Russians. Today they move toward new freedoms and toward cultural interchange with others. They have much to teach and they have much to learn. It is not enough for Mr. Zhidkov to say he is not a Communist, he is a Baptist. The question is how much does he learn *as a Baptist* from living and working in a Communist-ruled country? And how much influence *as a Baptist* does he exercise over the minds and hearts of his fellow-countrymen who are Communists? Freedom for *two-way* cultural interchange will flood not only Russia but all the world with a fruitful intellectual top-soil with promise of new harvests for the development and joy of mankind.

It is for this interchange that, with others, we have been crying in the wilderness for many years. Men like Prof. Needham of Cambridge University from the Marxist side and the Socialist Clergy from the Christian side have thrown lines to each other. The Dean of Canter-

bury is an historically important figure in this bridge-that-is-building. Leland Mathis has done some pioneer thinking in this project ("Possible Developments in Materialism", Leland Mathis, 83 Quincy Road, Riverside, Illinois, $1.00). Dr. Bradley of United People, Saskatoon, Sask., was one of the first and shrewdest critics of Party Dogmatism. Irwin Edelman of Los Angeles has recently broken through the constricting discipline of party thinking. The yeast has only begun to work. A great step has been taken forward with the peaceful invasion of the world by the Russians. Nearly 2 million men have been or are being released from the Russian war machine. Krushchev, Bulganin, Mikoyan, Malenkov and others are carrying friendship and disinterested help throughout the world. Listen to the prophetic words of Congressman Herbert M. Orrell, quoted from THE CHURCHMAN, June, 1956: "The events leading to the post-war split between Russia and the United States were based on human decisions. Ten years later, the improved atmosphere between Russia and the United States is likewise of human genesis. Initiated by men, it is being nurtured and furthered by men. Unlike the heroes of tragedy, what mortal men do they undo." And again: "Exploitation of man by man, racial bias, using people for one's own personal gain, manipulation of whole classes of people, all these are seen to be profoundly evil. For we know that such practices destroy not only the object but the subject as well." That such sentiments can be expressed by an American politician is surely a good omen. There is much, very much, for which a true theist, a true Christian, should be thankful. In Tunnicliffe's words, "God's Kingdom is upon us, not far away." And "many who seem to be within the Church of God are without it, and many who seem to be without the Church are really serving the cause of God." Let us repeat his prayer; "Dear God: forgive our unbelief. Help us to trust and to expect the utmost by Thy grace so abounding."

THE POWELL CASE

By Louise Harding

It is not alone in the U.S. that Washington has reached out a long arm and sought to deprive us of the facts. Some of the most audacious lying yet on record was done in attempts to justify the war on Korea and misrepresent its start. It got by largely by dint of threats to make things very unpleasant for those who question the MacArthur-Truman tale, grim visionings of concentration camps being thrown in to help.

In September 1954, John W. Powell and his wife Sylvia were called before a senate committee. Powell invoked the Fifth Amendment. No necessary sign of guilt according to the language of the Constitution. It may be the Committee which is guilty of harassing an innocent citizen.

Jenner, of Indiana, demanded that the Justice Dept. press treason press did not take a very favorable attitude toward the proceeding, press did not take a very favorable attitude towar dthe proceeding, and the matter was dropped for a time. It is now renewed. Apr. 25, the Powells were indicted on charges of sedition; and twelve other

counts were lodged against Powell. Says The Chronicle,

> "The indictment, at the onset, declared that both the Powells and Schuman (Julian Schuman was an associate editor of *China Monthly Review*, formerly published in Shanghai) were guilty of sedition 'while the United States was engaged in war with North Korean and Chinese Communists . . .'

—This is interesting. Of course Truman was entirely without authority to start war on Korea without authority of Congress, and he was obliged to fall back on the false claim that he acted by authority of the United Nations, and that the engagement in Korea was thus a "*police action.*" Now, in order to trap the Powells, it is necessary to speak of a Korean WAR. ("Now you see the little pea, gentlemen; under which shell do I conceal the pea?")

The Powells' magazine, continues The Chronicle, describing the charges.

> "allegedly was used by the Chinese Reds as a textbook in their brainwashing attempts on American prisoners."

And the indictment alleges that

> "the three conspired to 'convey false reports in the northern district of California and elsewhere in the United States by means of editorials, articles and cartoons in the *China Monthly Review* with intent to interfere with the operation and success of the military and naval forces of the United States and to promote the success of its enemies . . ."

Powell, Washington also claims, wrote disparagingly of Gen. Matthew Ridgway, then in Korea; accused this country of waging bacteriological warfare in Korea; and wrote that this country spread smallpox among civilian populations of temporarily occupied districts in Korea. Further, he stated U.S. is "internally corrupt." (See recent Drew Pearson articles on the Great Gas Scandal at Washington.)

Information was also given to the press, charging that *China Monthly Review* was subsidized by China. The truth is that the paper was so poor that, its circulation being interfered with by the post office department in the U.S., it was reduced from a weekly to a monthly and finally was forced to suspend.

As to that *brainwashing*, all it meant was that the prisoners were given information contrary to that previously handed out to them by their officers.

"This Week" section of the S.F. Chronicle, July 17, 1955, had an article by A. E. Hotchner, headed "*They Were Not Brainwashed!*". It was written in an Army Intelligence officers whose job it has been to study and evaluate the conduct of men who were prisoners of war in Korea." Answers were given Hotchner by these officers, in reply to his inquiry about 'brainwashing' and torture, as follows:

> "1. No man being prosecuted was 'brainwashed'—in fact no American military prisoner was 'brainwashed' during the entire Korean War.
>
> "2. No American PW has been or will be tried by the Army who was physically tortured. But torture, in the classic sense,

was not used at all as a means of obtaining converts.

"3. The Army has in no way violated its word in respect to PW's who at first refused repatriation.

"4. The men who did not collaborate with the enemy generally fared as well as or better in enemy hands than the men who did."

Nevertheless, The Reporter (NY), sometimes liberal, in its issue of Sept. 8, 1955, blandly carries this, under "Reporter's Notes":

"After long reflection upon the moral and military problems created by the brainwashing of American soldiers in Communist China's prison camps, a ten-man Pentagon committee has come up with a report detailing the tortures our men have endured and a Code of Conduct calling upon them in the future never to give in. "The President by Executive Order made the code binding on all members of the armed forces . . . "

In the same issue of this publication, Sir John Slessor also writes, with equal blandness, from London:

"Open military aggression like that in Korea in 1950 is, I think, unlikely provided we are properly equipped to meet it."

—This despite the fact that both Rhee and his former Prime Minister, Ben C. Limb, have *confessed* that South Korea *started the war, in order to fight Communism.*"

"God give us men . . .
Men who have honor, men who will not lie."

But they are very scarce! And the official who at this late day refers to Communist brainwashing" is not in their class.

"Plain Perfidy", by Wilfred Burchett and Alan Winnington, published in Peking in April 1954, carries convincing photographic proof that the prisoners in Chinese camps were in good health, while those coming up from South Korea, under Rhee and US Army, were emaciated wrecks, comparable to those found in Hitler's concentration camps.

In 1951, US soldiers in Chinese camps were writing home to their families:

"Vernet", to Miss Iva Jacobs, Rt. 1, Box 135, Gladwood, Minn.—
"Show and let the neighbors read this letter and convince them that this war over here was none of our affair and we should never stuck our noses into it. I am getting the best treatment that can possibly be obtained."

Master Sgt. J. E. Overend to Mrs. Teresa Overend, 529 Newark Ave., Jersey City, N.J.—
"This whole damn affair has been a crazy unnecessary nightmare. More killing and damage for not one good reason."

Pat de Beneditte, to his mother, 356 Jersey St., Staten Island, N.Y.—

"I read papers of some people in the U.S. believing the Chinese are aggressors. Right back at home are the aggressors. They are the reason why I'm here . . . It's a shame the way our planes are bombing these homes and cities and money makers are sitting behind a desk figuring out some more dirty ways of making money. . . . Get together back home. Let's go. Make some kind of organization up.

Wake up back there!"

The press frequently mentioned relatives in the United States who got photographs of prisoners and expressed pleasure to see them looking so well.

Germ Warfare.

To investigate this charge, a committee of eminent scientists went to North Korea and China in 1952. They issued a 300,000-word report after two months of study, unanimously asserting the truth of the charge. The members were:

Dr. Andrea Andreen of Sweden, Director Stockholm's Central Clinical Laboratory; Jean Malterre of France, Dir. Laboratory of Animal Physiology, Nat. College of Agriculture at Crignon; Dr. Joseph Needham of Britain, Reader in Biochemistry, Cambridge Univ.; Dr. Oliviero Olive of Italy, Professor of Anatomy, Univ. of Bologna; Dr. Samuel B. Pessoa of Brazil ,Professor of Parasitalogy at the Univ. of Sao Paolo; and Dr. U. N. Zhukov Verezhnikov of Russia, vice pres. Soviet Academy of Medicine. (Only one from a Communist-governed land).

A Hsinhua photo of Col. Frank H. Schwable broadcasting a statement on Germ warfare, February 1953, shows him obviously in good physical condition. Here are a few of the things he said in his deposition of Dec. 6, 1952:—

(Referring to orders given the First Marine Aircraft Wing)

"Absolutely nothing could appear in writing on the subject. The word 'bacteria' was not to be mentioned in any circumstance in Korea, except initially to identify 'super-propaganda' or "SUPROP."

"... I personally have never heard the subject mentioned or even referred to outside of the office, and I ate all of my meals in the Commanding General's small private mess, where many classified matters were discussed."...

"I do not say the following in defence of anyone, myself included. I merely report as an absolutely direct observation that every officer when first informed that the United States is using bacteriological warfare in Korea is both shocked and ashamed. I believe, without exception, we come to Korea as officers loyal to our people and government and believing what we have always been told about bacteriological warfare—that it is being developed only for use in retaliation in a third world war.

"For these officers to come to Korea and find that their own government has so completely deceived them..."etc.

Schwable didn't have to put that in, unless it was true. His deposition is full of names of officers who were involved; and *not one of them has ever made denial.* Reporter Burchett says correspondents were not allowed to go near these officers under any circumstances.

(If correspondents persisted, Burchett said they were threatened with being returned to the States).

Another thing Schwable said was:

"Every means possible was taken to mislead the enemy and to deny knowledge of these operations to our own personnel... The

point was emphasized :'Forget it in Korea whenever you can, and when you go home, you never heard of it."

Washington, Nov. 1 (UP)—The Marine Corps plans an "official" investigation into the case of Col. Frank H. Schwable, who "confessed" under Red torture to conducting "germ warfare" in Korea, it was disclosed today.

The inquiry may go far toward determining the over-all military attitude toward men who broke under Communist torture in Korean prison camps .

—But, arriving at Penmunjon for exchange, Schwable had already told reporters that the only "torture" he underwent was *mental*, by repeated and lengthy examinations. And even this charge may be explained by the fact that he further said he feared *trial for treason*, because of his confessions.

Jan. 21, 1953, a deposition was made by Major Roy H. Bley, Ordinance Officer of the same aircraft wing as Schwable: A photograph shows him smiling, and evidently well fed. Quoting Col. Clark, Logistics Officer of the First Marine Aircraft Wing—

"Then he paused and asked: 'What do you think of the use of the germ bomb?' I said: 'Sir, it's not only against my own principles but it would also certainly leave a black mark against the Marine Corps reputation.' The Colonel said he didn't approve of its use either, nor did anyone else in the Wing, but we were ordered to do so by higher authority and there was nothing to do but obey our commands."

(That way Hitler's officers also tried to excuse themselves.)

The affidavits directly implicated:—*The U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff*, Asst. Commanding Gen. *Lamson-Scribner*, Col. *Arthur A. Binney*, Gen. *Ridgway*, Gen. *Weyland*, Gen. *Everest*, Gen. *Schilt*.

As John Powell says, being on the ground in China, he published what he considered to be true.—It was Harry Truman, sent to the U.S. Senate as a representative of the notorious Pendergast gang, who deliberately lied, and led the United States, and a great part of the world, into the horrors of the War that was not a War. It is shameful—and significant—that, after all the expenses, Truman remains a popular hero in (uninformed) U.S.A. today.

Those wanting to help the defense of the Powells get under way, may for the present send checks to

Louise Harding Horr
Box 457, Brisbane, California

(If currency is sent, it should be registered).

Receipt will be promptly mailed.

NEW CHRISTIAN

MAY-JUNE 1956

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. Imre Kadar
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Ida Pruit
Leslie Roberts
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etienne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams
Rev. Mercer Wilson

NEW CHRISTIAN is published monthly by New Christian Books, Elmsdale, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No Agents.**